PROVO RIVER DISTRIBUTION SYSTEM PROPOSED ASSESSMENT PROCEDURE

In the current system, assessments are calculated on each account except power accounts according to the assessment units assigned to each account. The units are named Wentz Numbers after a former river commissioner who developed the system. The Wentz Numbers were determined as follows:

For canals below Deer Creek, the Wentz units assigned to each account are equal to 165 (the number of days that Wentz figured they got water during a year) times the flow rate (cfs) listed in the Morse Decree for the period from June 20th to July 20th.

For canals above Deer Creek, the Wentz units assigned to each account are equal to 130 days times 1st class right flow rate plus 90 days times the sum of the flows for the other classes of rights.

For storage in the upper lakes, the Wentz units assigned to each account are equal to the storage right divided by 2.

According to this method, multiplying the Wentz number on any account by 2 would give an approximation of the number of acre feet allowed by the right. In the 1965 commissioners report, the deputy commissioner updated the rights on the upper Provo River following the pattern given above and those are the units being used today.

It is proposed that the distribution system keep the current assessment method with some modifications to reflect the current conditions on the river.

The Heber Power account will be deleted from the system, it is no longer in use. It is proposed that there be no change in assessment method for the other power account. The assessment would be based on a percentage of the total system assessment; the percentage would not change. The total power assessment will be billed to the Central Utah Water Conservancy District. The District will bill the power company for the water they generate power on. The District will also bill any other water users who divert and use power water based on the amount diverted. The District will pay the assessment on the portion of power water kept in storage. This information is being kept now by the commissioner.

It is proposed that there be no change in the method of assessment for most of the irrigation companies and individuals. The assessment would continue to be based on the Wentz numbers currently assigned to the account.

It is proposed that the Wentz number for the Central Utah Water Conservancy District account (Jordanelle Reservoir) be 53,750 which is based on the ultimate annual delivery anticipated by CUWCD.

It is proposed that the Wentz number for the Provo River Water Users Association account (Deer Creek Reservoir) be 50,000 which is based on the ultimate annual delivery from storage.

Some water users have made changes in the use of their water which considerably increases the effort required of the commissioner to regulate and account for their water use. In these situations, it is proposed that a multiplier be applied to the Wentz number in the water users account. The multiplier would be set according to the percentage of the users' water right that requires extra accounting or regulation by the commissioner. The multipliers now proposed are 1.25 for the Provo Bench Canal Company and 1.70 for the Provo Reservoir Water Users Company. The multiplier would be used to increase the Wentz number on the account relative to the Wentz numbers on the other accounts.

It is proposed that the minimum assessment be raised to \$20 over the next two years. In 1996, it will be \$15 and the \$20 in 1997.

A growing number of water users have entered into contracts with the Central Utah Water Conservancy District for project water to be used from groundwater by exchange. It is proposed that these users be assessed at the rate of \$20 per acre foot. CUWCD will report the number of acre feet under contract each year. The assessment to CUWCD will include the assessment for these users. CUWCD will in turn bill each of the contract holders based on the amount of acre feet exchanged. CUWCD currently has 79 acre feet of water under contract.

In brief, the assessment calculation would follow the these steps:

- 1. The power assessment would be calculated.
- 2. The CUWCD exchange users assessment would be calculated.
- 3. The amount of the minimum assessments would be calculated.
- 4. The remaining assessment amount would be determined by deducting the power, exchange, and minimum assessments from the total assessment.
- 5. Any multipliers on accounts would be applied to the . Wentz numbers of those accounts.
- 6. The total of the Wentz numbers for the system (excluding those accounts which paid the minimum assessment)

would be determined.

7. The remaining assessment amount (determined in step 4.) would be proportioned to each account according to the ratio of its Wentz number (as increased by any multipliers) to the total Wentz number for the system (determined in step 6.)

The commissioner's work in regulating fish flows on the river is in addition to what would normally be expected of a commissioner. It is proposed that it be compensated for separately as contract work. It is proposed that it be assessed to the CUWCD on an annual fee basis. The basis for the fee, for now would be 45 hours per season at a rate of \$30 per hour with \$150 for travel expenses for a total of \$1500. It is recognized that this does not take into account the overtime or odd hour factor that is involved in a lot of the work for the fish flows. The District will bill the Bureau of Reclamation to recover the costs of the fish flow regulation. The fee for this contract work would not be included in the calculation of the assessment for the other water users.

It is proposed that this procedure be used during 1996 on a trial basis to determine if adjustments need to be made.

It is proposed that several aspects of the assessment process be discussed each year at the annual meeting and that the assessment process be reviewed in detail each 3 to 5 years. Annually the committee should:

- a. Review the assessment for Stan's contract fish flow work. The amount of the fee for the coming year would be set based on whether it appeared the effort required was increasing.
- b. Review the multipliers assigned. Determine if there are changes needed in the current multipliers or if multipliers need to be assigned to other accounts.
- c. Receive a report from CUWCD on the number of acre feet of exchange water it has contracted for.
- d. Review the minimum assessments to determine if there is a need for a change.

It is proposed that an explanation of the assessment process be included in the annual report each year.

PROVO RIVER DISTRIBUTION SYSTEM

COMPARISON OF CURRENT AND PROPOSED ASSESSMENT METHODS
1995 Assessment is used for the Comparison

	•		CURRENT METHOD	PROPOSED METHOD
Total System Assessment			\$101,028	\$101,028
Power Assessments			\$4,692	\$5,051
CUWCD Exchange Users (79 A.F.)			\$0	\$1,580
Minimum Assessments			\$970	\$2,500
Remaining Assessment			\$95,366	\$91,897
Major Water Users				
	Wentz No.	Multiplier		
Central Utah WCD (current)	0		\$20,221	
(proposed)	53,750			\$20,152
Charleston IC	3,899		\$1,745	\$1,462
E River Bottom IC	1,213		\$543	\$455
Extension IC	2,213		\$990	\$830
Fort Field Little Dry Cr	2,319		\$1,037	\$869
Geneva Steel	1,200		\$537	\$450
Island Ditch Co	1,064		\$476	\$399
Lake Bottom Canal	2,228		\$997	\$835
Midway IC	8,171		\$3,656	\$3,063
North Field IC	7,054		\$3,156	\$2,645
Provo Bench Canal	14,585	1.25	\$6,526	\$6,835
Provo City	13,682		\$6,126	\$5,130
Provo City Metro	1,026		\$459	\$385
Provo Reservoir WUC (regular)	16,237	1.7	\$7,265	\$10,349
(special)			\$2,613	
Provo River WUA (current)	35,000		\$15,661	
(proposed)	50,000			\$18,746
Sagebrush IC	1,458		\$652	\$547
So Kamas IC	4,525		\$2,025	\$1,696
Spring Creek Ditch IC	2,100		\$940	\$787
Sunrise IC	1,018	·	\$456	\$382
Timpanogas Canal Co	2,117		\$947	\$794
Timpanogas IC	7,100		\$3,177	\$2,662
Upper E Union IC	1,950		\$873	\$731
Wasatch IC	8,042		\$3,598	\$3,015
Washington IC	3,274		\$1,465	\$1,227
West Smith Ditch	1,127		\$504	\$423
West Union Canal	3,670		\$1,642	\$1,376
			\$88,287	\$86,243
Assessment from other water users			\$7,079	\$5,654

NOTES:

The above assesment calculations do not include the special assessment that would be made for the commissioner's contract work with the fish flows. That assessment amount will be made seperately and will not be included with the system assessment calculations.